UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

NOTICE OF DOCUMENT DISCREPANCIES

FILED
2008 MAR -7 AM 8:40
CLERK US DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA
BY DEPUTY

TO: ❑ U. S. DISTRICT JUDGE / ☑ U. S. MAGISTRATE JUDGE Brooks
FROM: R. Mullin, Deputy Clerk RECEIVED DATE: 3/3/2008
CASE NO.: 07cv2183 DMS (RBB) DOCUMENT FILED BY: Petitioner
CASE TITLE: Cunningham v. Marshall
DOCUMENT ENTITLED: First Amended Petition

Upon the submission of the attached document(s), the following discrepancies are noted:

✓	*Local Rule*	*Discrepancy*
❑	5.1	Missing time and date on motion and/or supporting documentation
❑	5.3	Document illegible or submitted on thermal facsimile paper
❑	**5.4**	**Document not filed electronically. Notice of Noncompliance already issued.**
❑	7.1 or 47.1	Date noticed for hearing not in compliance with rules/Document(s) are not timely
❑	7.1 or 47.1	Lacking memorandum of points and authorities in support as a separate document
❑	7.1 or 47.1	Briefs or memoranda exceed length restrictions
❑	7.1	Missing table of contents
❑	15.1	Amended pleading not complete in itself
❑	30.1	Depositions not accepted absent a court order
❑		Supplemental documents require court order
❑		Default Judgment in sum certain includes calculated interest
X		**OTHER: Requires leave of court.**

Date forwarded: 3/4/2008

ORDER OF THE JUDGE / MAGISTRATE JUDGE

IT IS HEREBY ORDERED:

☒ The document is to be filed nunc pro tunc to date received.

❑ The document is NOT to be filed, but instead REJECTED. and it is ORDERED that the Clerk serve a copy of this order on all parties.

Rejected document to be returned to pro se or inmate? ❑ Yes. Court Copy retained by chambers ❑

Counsel is advised that any further failure to comply with the Local Rules may lead to penalties pursuant to Local Rule 83.1

CHAMBERS OF: RBB

Dated: 3/5/2008 By: [signature]

cc: All Parties

K:\COMMON\FORMS\CIVCRM35.WPD
Form # Civ/Crim 35 (4/98) -- [Docuument Discrepancy / Court Order]